UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON AT SEATTLE

SAKINA ELLIS,

Plaintiff,

v.

DAVID KRUMP, et al.,

Defendants.

Case No. C21-1001-RSM

ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE

Pro se Plaintiff, Sakina Ellis, has been granted leave to proceed in forma pauperis in this matter. Dkt. #3. Her complaint and civil cover sheet list federal stalking and federal cyberstalking as the cause of action and seek relief in the form of an order of protection against David Krump, who is an alleged FBI/CIA Agent. Dkt. #4 at 1-2. She also names "Camp 2nd Chance" as another defendant in the case caption but provides no further information. *Id*.

The Court will dismiss a complaint at any time if the action fails to state a claim, raises frivolous or malicious claims, or seeks monetary relief from a defendant who is immune from such relief. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B).

Plaintiff's Complaint lists federal stalking, 18 U.S.C. 2261A, and federal cyberstalking, 18 U.SC. 875(c), as the causes of action but does not connect any facts to the statutes allegedly

ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE - 1

violated. Her civil cover sheet identifies several descriptions for the nature of the suit, including other contract, other personal injury, assault, libel & slander, personal injury - product liability, health care / pharmaceutical personal injury, other personal property damage, and violation of the Telephone Consumer Protection Act. Dkt. #1-2. The Complaint does not support these claims with specific facts presented in a clear and understandable manner. The statement of claim section was left blank, and the scant information provided in the remainder of her Complaint does not coherently connect any facts to the cited causes of action. She attaches two notes from a case manager stating that Plaintiff believes a man named David Krumm is stalking her, *see* Dkt. #4 at 11-12, as well as a note from Donald Grubb, M.D., stating that Plaintiff is "under extreme emotional distress," *id.* at 10, but provides no further detail. It is unclear to the Court how the facts as presented in this case could constitute violations of the cited statutes.

Considering all of the above, Plaintiff's Complaint fails to state a claim. Plaintiff's Complaint suffers from deficiencies that, if not adequately explained in response to this Order, will require dismissal. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B).

In Response to this Order, Plaintiff must write a short and plain statement telling the Court (1) the separate causes of action upon which her claims are based, (2) how Defendants violated each of those laws causing harm to Plaintiff, and (3) why this case should not be dismissed without prejudice. **This Response may not exceed six (6) double-spaced pages**. Plaintiff is not permitted to file additional pages as attachments. The Court will take no further action in this case until Plaintiff has submitted this Response.

Accordingly, the Court hereby finds and ORDERS that Plaintiff shall file a Response to this Order to Show Cause containing the detail above **no later than twenty-one (21) days from the date of this Order**. Failure to file this Response will result in dismissal of this case.

DATED this 29th day of July, 2021.

RICARDO S. MARTINEZ

CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE